



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

PROBLEMS OF THE TRANSVAAL:

BY KARL BLIND.

TWELVE years ago, when the Transvaal deputation came to London for the purpose of having the treaty of 1881 set aside and a new one put in its place, I repeatedly met Paul Krüger, the President of the South African Republic; General Smit, who had defeated the English troops at Majuba Hill; and the Rev. S. J. Du Toit, the Minister of Public Instruction. On one occasion it was at the house of Dr. Clark, who for some time acted as Consul-General of the Republic in England, and has been for years a member of the House of Commons. Jonkheer Beelaerts van Blokland was then also present, a member of the House of Deputies in the Netherlands, and during several years its Speaker. He is now the plenipotentiary envoy of the South African Republic to the governments of several Continental countries.

Our intercourse on that occasion, as well as when I was alone with the members of the deputation and their companion and secretary, Mr. Esselen, was of the friendliest and most confidential kind. In 1881 I had been a member of the Executive of the Transvaal Independence Committee in London, whose object it was to bring about the restoration of the rights of the oppressed Boer commonwealth. Not a few of the resolutions tending thereto had been framed by me. It need, therefore, scarcely be said that no opportunity was lacking for learning the state of things at the very source. My sympathies with the cause of a free country, which had been lawlessly overrun under Lord Beaconsfield whilst it was engaged in a dangerous war with natives, were self-understood.

Since the grave complication which has arisen through Dr. Jameson's robber-like raid, I have often been asked about Mr.

Krüger's personal appearance. I found him, in outward look, a simple man of the people, with strong, homely features, such as may often be seen among the masses in the Netherlands and in Lower Germany. His otherwise clean-shaven face was framed by bushy whiskers and a goatee beard. In his blue eyes there sparkled a strong gleam of quiet watchfulness. The whole caste of countenance indicated firmness of purpose. As the grandson of a German, he bore the unmistakeable mark of his descent. In his dress there was not the slightest pretence to elegance, but rather utter simplicity. He comfortably smoked his short pipe with manifest tranquillity of mind, but a close observer could not mistake the stubbornness underlying that calm behavior.

General Smit, whose name is connected with a famed historical deed, had a reserved and somewhat reticent manner. Full-bearded, and of fine traits, he was—so I heard—practically one-eyed, but in the sound eye left to him there was a penetrating glance. He seemed to be wholly a man of action, of very few words, but an attentive listener withal. Both Mr. Krüger and he spoke only in Dutch. The Rev. Mr. Du Toit, a small, dapper man, of darker hue than his companions, showed his French Huguenot blood clearly in his face and figure. He spoke English with perfect ease, and also knew German a little. I was somewhat surprised to find that he could not converse in the tongue of his ancestors; but the Huguenots who, centuries ago, went to Holland, and from there to the Cape, soon became fully merged with the Dutch, thus losing their native speech. Many family names of theirs were even adapted to the Teutonic language of the Hollanders, so that their original French meaning is only recognizable now to the learned.

I may mention here that the Dutch spoken and written in South Africa by the mass of the population of Netherlandish origin is somewhat different from the tongue of Holland itself. At the Cape, in the Orange Free State, and in Transvaal, a distinction is made between Dutch, African Dutch, and what is, curiously enough, simply called the African tongue. By the first-named word, the pure and genuine Dutch of Holland (*het zuivere, echte Hollands van Holland*) is meant. The second word refers to the language written and spoken in South Africa by the more cultivated classes—a language very close to Dutch proper, yet slightly different in its forms. The third

word, "African," signifies the peasant dialect of the Transvaal people. Now, to that dialect most descendants of those who were driven forth repeatedly into the wilderness by English rule, cling very tenaciously. They consider it a means, so to say, of additionally marking their own national character, as expressed in their republican form of government.

This three-fold shading-off in speech has, however, its disadvantages. It has acted to the detriment of the Dutch language in general; the spread of the English tongue, which is not hampered by such internal divisions, having been rather facilitated thereby. There is a movement now on foot in South Africa for bringing about a greater equalization in the written Dutch language, both as to its words and its orthography.

Being able to read the speech of the Netherlands, I had no difficulty in following what was said in that tongue by Mr. Du Toit. In Mr. Krüger's remarks, there frequently occurred dialect expressions less easily understood; but then the perfect English of the Minister of Public Instruction was at hand, and through him the conversation was mainly conducted.

On the subject at issue, there was of course, from the beginning, a thorough agreement. I have always prized the free institutions of England, on whose shores, in dire times of distress and persecution, after the overthrow of the popular cause on the Continent, I had found safety and new friends. At the same time I could not but take the side of a free Commonwealth, which, under a reactionary English Government, had been lawlessly overthrown, and whose burghers, in Mr. Gladstone's own words, when he was acting as leader of the opposition, were "rightly struggling to be free."

Mr. Gladstone called it a dishonorable and an insane act to endeavor "governing despotically a community of men who never were under our despotic power before," who were "Protestants in religion, Hollanders in origin, vigorous and obstinate and tenacious in character, even as we are ourselves." He spoke of "England being in the strange predicament of the free subjects of a Monarchy going to coerce the free subjects of a Republic, and to compel them to accept a citizenship which they decline and refuse." This was said at the end of 1879 and in the first months of 1880, on the eve of the Liberals coming to power with Mr. Gladstone as Prime Minister.

Mr. Chamberlain, now the Minister for the Colonies, once spoke of the Boers as of "a homely, industrious nation, animated by a deep and even stern religious sentiment, and they inherit from their ancestors—the men who won the independence of Holland from the oppressive rule of Philip II., of Spain—they inherit from them their unconquerable love of freedom and liberty. Are not these qualities which commend themselves to men of the English race? Are they not virtues which we are proud to think form the best characteristics of the English race? These men settled in the Transvaal in order to escape foreign rule. They had had many quarrels with the British. They left their homes in Natal, as the English Puritans left England and went to the United States, and they founded a little republic of their own in the heart of Africa. In 1852 we made a treaty with them. They agreed to give up slavery, which had hitherto prevailed in their midst, and we agreed to respect and guarantee their independence; and I say, under these circumstances, is it possible we could maintain a forcible annexation of the country without the accusation of having been guilty, I will not say of national folly, but I say of a national crime?"

In speaking of the Puritans going to the United States, Mr. Chamberlain anticipated, as it were, in the heat of the discourse, the establishment of a form of government in America in which the Puritans certainly had a good share. From the tone of the two prominent Liberal leaders just quoted, as well as from discourses of Lord Hartington, it may be gathered what the feeling then was among the advanced section of their party. Unfortunately, when the new Liberal Government soon afterwards came in after general elections, the promises made were not fulfilled. Seeing themselves deceived in their hopes, the citizens of the Transvaal thereupon rose with arms in hands, and finally gained the victory over the regular troops of England.

In the meanwhile, as matters threatened to come to a head, a "Transvaal Independence Committee" had been formed in London, with a goodly number of members of Parliament in it. The late Sir Charles Trevelyan, formerly Governor of Madras and Financial Minister in India, proposed the first resolution for the establishment of the committee; but expressed himself in rather timid terms, warning against anything being done which might lay the members open to a charge of high treason. This

was rather calculated to damp the spirits of those present and gave small hope of an energetic agitation.

After Dr. Clark had seconded the proposition, I therefore thought it my duty to say at once that our aim and object must be the restoration of the full and absolute independence of the Transvaal under its old name, the South African Republic. In the subsequent deliberations of our committee, Sir Charles Trevelyan (the father of the ex-Cabinet Minister in Mr. Gladstone's last government) did not take part any more; and pusillanimous counsels were no longer heard.

By its firm resolutions, by the action of members of Parliament who were in connection with it, and by public meetings, the Committee succeeded in rousing Liberal public opinion thoroughly. Yet, Government gave no sign of doing the right thing, in the sense of making good the promises held out by its chief leaders, when in opposition. So the war between mighty England and the small population of Boers scattered over the vast Transvaal territory went on, much to the indignation of the progressive parties all over Europe. Under these circumstances, the idea was started, during the presence, in London, of three delegates of the Transvaal Committee from Holland, of getting up an International Address, to be presented to a prominent member of the English Government, and for which signatures would be sought, first of all, from the foremost leaders of thought in Europe and America—men distinguished in science, in literature, in poetry, as well as in politics.

Proceeding from this idea, I drew up the following memorial to the Right Hon. John Bright, who during the American war had also proved to be on the right side :

"SIR : At a moment when England has to contend against home difficulties of unusual magnitude—difficulties in regard to which all true and sensible friends of Progress hope at the same time for reform, and for the firm maintenance of the great state structure of the British realm—it is a painful sight to the well-wishers of the powerful English nation to see its military forces engaged in a life and death struggle with one of the smallest self governing communities of the earth, for the sake of maintaining an unprovoked and unjust aggression, against which the overwhelming majority of that community has repeatedly protested, and which some of the foremost men of the present English Government have themselves stigmatized as an 'unwise,' nay, an 'insane,' act, an act of wrongful invasion and of 'despotism,' which ought not to be upheld by force of arms against an unwilling people of freemen.

"We are glad, however, to find that the public conscience of England is

beginning to be awakened, that thousands of men among you are already calling for an act of justice and generosity, which would only do honor to the Government by stopping a deplorable war in which the first principles are violated that are acknowledged as guiding maxims by all those who acknowledge popular right.

"Loath as we are to have the slightest appearance of desiring to interfere in the public concerns of your nation, we feel justified in saying, on the part of numerous sympathizers among us, that we readily join our voices, to those among your countrymen who wish to see the claims of the South African Republic treated in the sense indicated by the former speeches of Mr. Gladstone and the Marquis of Hartington. We trust, nay, we are fully convinced from your long and noble championship of the people's cause that these cannot but be also your own views; and hence it is to you that we take the liberty of addressing this appeal—which is an appeal in favor of Humanity, of Public Right, of Popular Self government, and of Peace."

The hope I entertained of seeing this International Address numerously signed by distinguished representative men, was fully realized. For many days letters and telegrams poured in at the Committee Rooms and in my house, from the Netherlands, from Germany, Austria-Hungary, France and Italy; those from the Universities of Leyden and Utrecht, in Holland, and from Germany, being especially numerous. Among the signatures were those of Professor Harting, Professor Kuenen, Berthold Auerbach, Dr. Bluntschli, Friedrich von Bodenstedt, Professor Ludwig Büchner, Dr. Moritz Carrière, Felix Dahn, George Ebers, Kuno Fischer, Professor Forchhammer, Ernst Haeckel, Prof. Franz von Holtzendorff, Emil Rittershaus, Dr. Schultze-Delitzsch, Professor Schleiden, Rudolph Virchow, Dr. Max Wirth, Friedrich Kapp, Johannes Ronge, Ludwig Walisrode, Dr. Eduard Herbst and Franz Rechbauer (both leading members of the Austrian Reichsrath), Heinrich Laube, Edmond About, Louis Blanc, Pascal Duprat, Victor Schoelcher, Wilfrid de Fonvielle, Dr. A. Regnard, Auguste Vacquerie, Count Terenzio Mamiani, Aurelio Saffi, once the co-Triumvir of Mazzini, in the Roman Republic, and many others. It was a galaxy of men of science, of philosophers, poets, political economists, and parliamentary leaders.

The introductory words of the address were in conformity with John Bright's well-known Liberal Unionist views in home affairs. He had been the champion of the American Union Cause at a time when it was difficult in the extreme to make headway against the current of English opinion; and he was in his own country for the maintenance of the Legislative Union between Great Britain

and Ireland. In a letter I wrote to him at the request of the Transvaal Independence Committee, when forwarding the International Appeal, I said, as regards the prominent men who had signed it :

“In not a few cases, some of the most distinguished among them have added letters in which they express the warmest feelings of esteem for the English nation as the promoter of civilization, progress, and freedom ; declaring at the same time, in almost identical terms, though writing from different places, that they consider it a great honor to be allowed to sign their names to an appeal addressed to you personally. The interesting remembrance of conversations I had the pleasure of holding with you some time ago makes it all the more a grateful task to be the intermediary of this communication.”

I had met John Bright at the reception of General Grant in London, in consequence of an invitation addressed to me and my wife by the American Minister. I had also held extensive conversation with him at a friend's house during the last Russo-Turkish war, when, after dinner, he not only spoke to me on that subject, with great animation, for an astoundingly long time, but even insisted afterwards on accompanying me, towards midnight, through the streets, so as to continue the conversation yet longer. On that question, it is true, we could come to no agreement, his somewhat pro-Russian views being totally opposed to mine. I had also been in correspondence with John Bright, whose Unionist views in Irish affairs I fully shared. It was to such previous personal contact that the concluding words of my letter to him on Transvaal affairs referred.

His answer ran thus :

132 PICCADILLY, March 14, 1881.

DEAR SIR : I thank you for the Memorial you have forwarded to me, and for the friendly letter from yourself on the sad question of the Transvaal difficulty.

I hope the prospect is one of peace and not of further war, and that an arrangement may be made satisfactory to the Transvaal people, and honorable to this country. *I scarcely need to assure you that whatever influence I possess is being and will be exerted in favor of peace.* The conflict is one in which England can gain nothing; not even military glory, which is the poorest kind of glory, in my view, which men and nations strive for. I hope the time may come when nations will seek and obtain honorable renown by deeds of mercy and justice.

This reply to your letter and the memorial is brief, but, under the circumstances, I feel sure that you and your friends will excuse its brevity.

Believe me to be very sincerely yours,

JOHN BRIGHT.

Such a declaration on the part of a Cabinet Minister who once had been called the "Tribune of the People," who stood next in importance to Mr. Gladstone, and who, from a popular point of view, was even the chief leading force, could not but have a signal effect. The discussions in the English Cabinet are always strictly withheld from public knowledge. There could be no doubt, however, in what sense Mr. Bright would, after the presentation of such a memorial, exert his influence in the Cabinet. As a matter of fact, peace was soon afterwards concluded. "Complete self-government" was restored to the Transvaal territory, as it had been called since its violent annexation to the English Colonial possessions; and it was henceforth to be known under the name of the "Transvaal State."

Its old name, the South African Republic, was thus avoided. Worse than this, it was declared to be "subject to the suzerainty of Her Majesty, her heirs and successors." Nay, the English Crown reserved to itself "the right to move troops through the said State in time of war, or in case of the apprehension of immediate war between the suzerain power and any foreign State or native tribe in South Africa." A British Resident was also appointed "as representative of the suzerain," and he was to "receive from the government of the Transvaal State such assistance and support as can by law be given to him for the due discharge of his functions."

These conditions agreed to, under stress of circumstances, by numerically so small a people, who had bearded and inflicted a signal defeat upon a country owning the seventh part of the globe, were felt to be intolerable, in the long run, by the mass of the Boers. They were resolved, cost it what it would, not to bear any longer a foreign suzerainty. Hence the Deputation from the Transvaal in 1883, composed—as mentioned before—of President Krüger, General Smit, and the Rev. Mr. Du Toit.

After protracted negotiations, they succeeded in having the English suzerainty claim, which had been inscribed in the preamble and in three paragraphs (2, 18 and 33) of the Convention of 1881, *formally struck out*. Together with this, the right of the Crown to move troops through the Transvaal in time of war or in case of the apprehension of immediate war was also abolished. Once more the country was now acknowledged as the South African Republic. The British Resident, too, was done away with.

In the third article of this new Treaty of February 27, 1884, it was laid down that, if a British officer is appointed to discharge functions analgous to those of a Consul, he will receive the protection of the Republic. So the Commonwealth was again independent. It was no longer under the protection of a suzerain, but on the contrary, it gave protection to the Consul of what was henceforth again—as before 1877—a foreign Power.

In spite of this clear arrangement the existence of a suzerainty has for years been over and over again asserted in the English press and by agitators bent upon destroying the South African Republic. One of the most persistent among these latter is, I regret to say, an American by origin, therefore, a born Republican, Sir Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett, a member of the Conservative party in the English House of Commons. Since the failure of Dr. Jameson's robber-like raid, the object of which—in the words of the *Daily News*—was to steal the gold and diamond fields of the Transvaal, these disappointed annexationists have falsely and unscrupulously sought to deceive public opinion by alleging the continuance of the suzerainty. They have called the South African Republic a "British territory," a "colony," a "vassal" of the English crown; nay, even simply "our own." But they have carefully refrained from dealing with the irrefutable evidence contained in Lord Derby's correspondence with the Transvaal Deputation, in the text of the new Treaty of 1884, and in the confessions made both by Mr. W. H. Smith, the First Lord of the Treasury of a Conservative Cabinet, on February 28, 1890, and by Mr. Buxton, a Liberal Minister, on July 3, 1890.

I can testify that the Transvaal Deputation would never have signed the new treaty if the suzerainty title had not been struck out. They came to London for that purpose, and they succeeded in it. The assertion made by the would-be annexationists that the treaty of 1884 is merely a modification of the Convention of 1881, and that the preamble of the latter, which speaks of suzerainty, still holds good, is given the lie to by Lord Derby's letter to the Transvaal Deputation of February 15, 1884. There he wrote :

"The progress which has been made, appears to me to render it convenient that I should now transmit for your perusal a draft of the *new Convention* which Her Majesty's Government propose in substitution for the

Convention of Pretoria. In this draft the articles of the Convention of Pretoria, which will no longer be in force, have been printed alongside of the proposed new articles, and where an article is retained and altered, the alterations have been shown in order to explain clearly the changes that will be made."

Now, in the preamble of the new treaty, and in all its paragraphs, the suzerainty is entirely dropped. A single paragraph of the old treaty, referring to complete freedom of religion, was preserved and literally embodied in the new treaty. Years afterwards, in answer to interpellations, both a Conservative and a Liberal Minister, Mr. Smith and Mr. Buxton, acknowledged in Parliament that the treaty of 1884 contains no reservation of the Queen's right of suzerainty. Public opinion in England, unacquainted as it is with the diplomatic documents, is, therefore, shamefully duped by those who still affirm the existence of a suzerainty, and who craftily endeavor to read the provisions of the older abolished convention into the entirely new one.

I can speak with all the greater confidence of these matters as I had full personal opportunity of following the course of the negotiations of 1883-84. Half an hour before the treaty was finally signed, its English and Dutch text was placed in my hands at the residence of the Transvaal Deputation, where I had again seen President Krüger. From sympathy with the cause of a wronged republic I have held it to be a duty to bear testimony to this main point in letters to the *Times*, the *Daily News*, and the *North British Daily Mail*; and no one has dared to dispute the plain facts.

It is from the fourth article of the new Treaty of 1884 that the enemies of the South African Republic, who untruthfully mix up the two treaties, try once more to evolve a suzerainty claim. That article says that :

"The South African Republic will conclude no treaty or engagement with any State or nation other than the Orange Free State, nor with any native tribe to the eastward or westward of the Republic, until the same has been approved by Her Majesty the Queen."

It is added that such approval shall be considered to have been granted, if Her Majesty's Government shall not, within six months, have notified that the conclusion of the treaty is in conflict with British interests. This is, no doubt, an irksome stipulation; but it does not constitute a suzerainty, which, as

stated, was formally abolished. I may mention here that, in conversation with the Transvaal Deputation, previous to the signature of the treaty, I expressed my firm belief that, if they refused signing any stipulation which would encroach in whatsoever manner upon the full rights of their country, they would be sure to gain their point. The state of affairs inside and outside the Cabinet was then such that I had not the slightest doubt about their final success. However, the Deputation were satisfied with having realized their main object and acceded to a stipulation which they probably—but as is seen now, erroneously—thought to be of small consequence.

Here it may be remarked that, historically speaking, many a weak country has now and then had to make an irksome concession to a strong power, without the latter becoming thereby constituted Suzerain, or regaining a suzerainty which it had relinquished. Yet, there are also other cases in which a weak community obtained remarkable privileges at the expense of a strong power. Thus the Swiss Confederacy had the right, even after the peace of Westphalia (1648), of moving its troops, if a war threatened, up to a certain line in the German Black Forest, for the better protection of its own exposed northern frontier. Now, did the great German Empire thereby become the vassal of little Switzerland?

Even down to our days, the Swiss Confederacy maintained its right of sending troops, in a similar case, into Savoy. Now, did the Kingdom of Sardinia thereby become the vassal of Switzerland? The idea is absurd. Well, in the same way the South African Republic, after having had English suzerainty struck out, does not become the vassal of England through the separate stipulation in Article IV. of the Treaty of 1884. I have insisted on this for years; and it is now the expressed view of legists, statesmen and governments all over Europe.

On the part of England, the spirit of the Treaty of 1884 has undoubtedly been violated in consequence of English forces having overrun and annexed the territory north of the South African Republic, with whose native tribes the latter, according to the fourth article, had been left free to enter into treaties. That possibility was thus forcibly taken away from the Boer Commonwealth, which was surrounded and hemmed in from all

sides, to be squelched and extinguished at some convenient time.

Still, even so late as December 31 of last year, when Dr. Jameson burst into the Transvaal, Mr. Chamberlain, as Minister of the Colonies, acknowledged in a despatch to the British South Africa Company, that "the South African Republic is *a foreign State*, with which Her Majesty is at peace and *in treaty relations*." In the course of the same despatch he repeatedly speaks of that Commonwealth as a foreign State and "*a foreign power*," saying that "one of the obligations of Her Majesty the Queen is to respect the right to self-government of the South African Republic, subject to the provisions of the Conventions between Her Majesty and that State."

Now, a foreign power cannot possibly be a vassal, a colony, or a territory, of another power. The only slip in Mr. Chamberlain's despatch is, that it refers to "Conventions" in the plural instead of to *the* Convention of 1884; the one of 1881 having been altogether superseded, as Lord Derby himself averred for the satisfaction of the Transvaal Deputation, before the new treaty was signed.

It has been a painful duty to me to have to expose all the attempts made by force, fraud, and frivolous misrepresentation against the rights of a free commonwealth by citizens of a country which has become to me a second home, and whose cause I have not rarely defended, though rather, now and then, to my personal disadvantage. But even as in the case of the great American Republic, more than thirty years ago, when English statesmen and the vast majority of the governing classes went utterly wrong, so also in the case of the South African Republic, I could not shirk that task, however unpleasant. I felt it all the more a bounden duty, because the Transvaal Deputation before leaving London, had entrusted the defence of their cause, so to say, to my hands for the future.*

Of the aims and objects and the authorship of the last crimi-

* Letter of the Transvaal Deputation to Karl Blind:

ALBEMARLE HOTEL, Albemarle Street, London, W.,

June 18, 1884.

MY DEAR SIR:—Allow me heartily to thank you for the kind sentiments expressed in yours of yesterday's date, which is quite in accordance with your sympathy always shown in every struggle of the oppressed against the oppressor, and especially of our young Republic, which we confidently recommend to your favor for the future. The Deputation most heartily greets you and your friends.

Yours sincerely,

S. I. DU TOIT.

nal assault against the South African Republic, there is full evidence at hand. It was the enterprise of a financial and mining ring, with whose pecuniary interests not a few high-born and titled personages in England are bound up. The Chartered Company's shares having been depreciated, a new Golden Age was to be introduced by the aid of free-booters with Maxim guns. It is a Panama affair on other lines.

Together with this corrupt motive, the ambition of the so-called "Diamond King," the "Napoleon of South Africa"—or perhaps it would be more correct to say now, the Boulanger of South Africa—was the decisive element in the concoction of the scheme. There is a party which aims at the foundation of an "African Empire from the Cape to Cairo." The Transvaal Republic and the Orange Free State are stumbling blocks in its way. This great African party is impatient even of the existence of German and Portuguese colonies and of the extent of the Congo Free State. It would fain do away with all these impediments, by hook or by crook.

Mr. Cecil Rhodes, who is at the bottom of the venture, at one time handed the useful sum of £10,000 to Mr. Parnell, when the object was so to embroil and to occupy England, his own native country, at home as to leave him a free hand in South Africa. It was a curious proof of lofty patriotism. Incidentally, I may mention here that in 1881, during the struggle of the Transvaal burghers, there was a plan started in London of joining the Irish cause to that of the Boers, by sending out free corps to the latter, whilst in Ireland itself the crisis was at its height. As a member of the Transvaal Independence Committee, I set my face at once, in the responsible quarter of the committee, against this idea of endangering the legislative institutions of the United Kingdom, and the proposal was dropped. Had it ever been brought before the Committee it would certainly have been rejected.

Whilst formerly acting as the confederate of the Irish League, Mr. Rhodes, for purposes of his own, underwent various subsequent changes in his political attitude. Originally on the English side in the Cape Colony, he made a compact with the Dutch party in order to gain the support of the so-called "Africander Bond," and to maintain himself in the Premiership. Then he turned "English" once more, and even succeeded in being appointed a member of the Queen's Privy Council.

Having shown himself false to the principles of the *African-der League*, which represents the Dutch element in South Africa, and which counts adherents also in the *Transvaal*, he aimed at the overthrow of the *South African Republic*, whose productive diamond and gold fields had excited the cupidity of the *Chartered Company*, of which he is a director and the leading spirit. The expected yield in gold and silver and precious stones of *Mashonaland* and *Matabeleland* had not come up to the hopes of the *Chartered Company*. Its shares had gone down. So it was resolved to make the *Transvaal Republic* go down and to seize its property, when the *Orange Free State* would soon collapse, too. No wonder the leader of the Dutch party at the Cape, *Mr. Hofmeyr*, feeling his own party betrayed, cut his connection with *Mr. Rhodes*, with whom formerly he had been hand in glove.

No sooner had *Mr. Rhodes* fled than *President Krüger* was advised by an *English Unionist Government* to grant *Home Rule* to the *Rand*! What would be said in England if, immediately after an insurrectionary French inroad into Ireland, a French government were to urge England to grant home rule to the *Emerald Isle*? No wonder the head of the *South African Republic* sees in the hasty publication of such a scheme, which in his opinion would simply be a new means of organizing civil war, little hope for the quieting down of the very natural apprehensions of his fellow-citizens.

Add to this that all kinds of English politicians and many papers, following a recent cue from headquarters, are in the habit now of speaking of England as "the paramount Power" in South Africa. To many of them this evidently seems a more convenient phrase than the provably false title of "suzerainty." But it is an equally deceptive expression. England is certainly the paramount Power at the Cape, in Natal, and in all her own possessions in South Africa. But she is not the paramount Power in the perfectly independent *Orange Free State*, nor in the *Transvaal Republic*, which in 1884 got rid of her suzerainty. Nor is she, of course, the paramount Power in the large Portuguese and German possessions on the eastern and western coast of South Africa, or in the *Congo Free State*, a considerable section of which lies within the *South African region*.

Public opinion all over the continent of Europe has, on this

present occasion, declared against the wrong done to an inoffensive free commonwealth. In Germany the feeling has been specially strong. It is to be accounted for partly by the interests which Germany has in South Africa; partly by the close kinship in race and speech between the Boers and the people of Lower Germany; partly by the appeal which President Krüger made in 1884, when he came to Berlin, to the German Government—an appeal he repeated in a speech at Pretoria last year on the occasion of a festival held on the birthday of William II. A responsive chord was early struck. The first President of the Transvaal Republic, Pretorius, after whom the capital is named, was of German origin. Mr. Krüger's ancestors, he is fond of saying, were Germans. There are various settlements in the Transvaal Republic bearing German town-names, such as Heidelberg, and several others. In the last dangerous crisis the great majority of the German immigrants sided with the Republic offering their services as soldiers without delay.

Only those who want to destroy the Republic could take offence at the display of these sympathies. It was in consequence—as is well known now—of a telegram, dated December 31, from German inhabitants of Pretoria to the Emperor William that he sent to President Krüger the congratulatory message which raised such a needless alarm and indignation in England. As to the alleged desire of the Transvaal Government to see a German imperial protectorate established over the South African Republic, nothing could certainly be further from the intentions of President Krüger and his doughty countryman. Nor is there any such desire and intention in Germany itself. Her Minister of Foreign Affairs has spoken out clearly on that point.

All that Germany and other continental powers insist on is that no violence should be attempted against the South African Republic. If even an emperor says so, for once, that pleasure need not be grudged to him. In the German White Book, his utterance, being out of the range of diplomacy and a strictly personal one, is not recorded. The ministry of the Empire, however, covers his sentiments with its own responsibility; and for the sake of the maintenance of the republic, that is so far correct and satisfactory. Of hostility to England, there is nothing in all this, unless it were held to be a hostile act to condemn a highhanded freebooter who has proved false to the

official trust placed in him, whose lawless deed has been censured by the English Government itself, but who has been sung as a hero by the new poet laureate.

It would be an evil day for Europe if two nations like England and Germany, brothers in blood, and natural friends, who have stood shoulder to shoulder on battle-fields, in order to resist the aggressions of ambitious French despots, were to be estranged, owing to the criminal deed of a faithless English Administrator. What would become of international right and justice if such an act as his were tolerated and condoned?

There is Switzerland. She has a population of barely three millions, and is surrounded by three great monarchies and by another country which has, within this century, six times changed its institutions from the Republican to the Imperial, Royal, and again to the Republican form of government. Those four countries possess enormous military strength. Switzerland might be torn to pieces by them to-morrow, if her existence were not placed under international guarantee. She might be divided among Germany, of which centuries ago she formed an integral part, France and Italy, in accordance with the German, French, Italian, and Romance races and languages of her inhabitants.

To strike out Switzerland from the book of independent nations, would be a crime at which freemen all over the world would stand aghast. Now look at a map of Africa, and see what enormous extent of territory already belongs to England—most of it acquired by her since the last twenty years. The South African Republic and the Orange Free State are, in comparison with that territory, mere specks. They are surrounded by and englobed in those colossal English possessions. They constitute, so to say, an African Switzerland. Shall free and powerful England be the means of annihilating them? It would be a dark and indelible blot upon her escutcheon; and all that can be done to hinder the perpetration of so shameful a crime, will be a service to right, to justice, and to England's own freedom and fame.

KARL BLIND.